

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18, 20, and 22-24 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claims 22 and 23.

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner alleged that it is unclear whether the claims are an article of manufacture or a machine described in the limitations. Applicant has amended claims 22 and 23 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment be entered whether or not the Application is in condition for allowance because it materially reduces and simplifies the issues for appeal.

Claims 1-14, 17, 18, 20, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. 2003/0009730) in view of Dole (U.S. 6,634,008) and Haase ("Design Methodology for IP Providers"). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Dole and Haase, and further in view of Frank et al. (U.S. 6,782,511).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-18, 20, and 22-24.

Claim 1 recites:

A method for designing a new integrated circuit (IC) based on IC designing information transmitted from a manager, the IC designing information including standard library designing information and custom library designing information and being stored in, and managed by, the manager, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) transmitting at least part of the IC designing information, including a portion of the standard library designing information, from the manager to a design terminal through the Internet;

(b) designing the new IC by a user located at the design terminal in accordance with the at least part of the IC designing information;

(c) transmitting newly designed IC information, including new IC testing information to evaluate the new IC, from the design terminal to the manager through the Internet;

(d) evaluating the new IC by the manager based on the newly designed IC information; and

(e) adding at least part of the newly designed IC information to the custom library designing information that is stored in the manager, thereby updating the custom library designing information. (emphasis added)

Applicant's claims 17, 20, and 22-24 recite features that are similar to the features and method steps recited in Applicant's claim 1, including the above-emphasized features and method step.

The Examiner maintained the prior art rejections from the previous Office Action and alleged that Applicant's arguments were addressed to features not recited in the claims, and that Chen et al. does appear to teach that the SOC designs may be used by other designers. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, Applicant referred to the feature of the standard library designing information as element 206 of Chen et al., even though the Examiner referred to the standard library designing information as element 220 of Chen et al., because element 206 of Chen et al. more accurately corresponds to the claimed feature of the standard library designing information (see, for example, Applicant's arguments on page 14 and the paragraph bridging pages 14 and 15 in the Amendment filed June 13, 2007). More importantly, element 206 of Chen et al. includes element 220 of Chen et al. See, for example, paragraph [0034] of Chen et al. which states:

As illustrated, for the embodiment, **IP package 206 includes package description 210 and its constituting parts 210 and its constituting parts 220** (or pointers/links to these parts 220). (emphasis added)

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegation in section iii. on pages 6 and 7 of the outstanding Office Action, Applicant's arguments regarding element 206 of Chen et al. inherently include element 220 of Chen et al. and are directed to the rejections in the previous Office Action.

Consequently, Applicant's argument that the standard library designing information 206 of Chen et al. is only available for downloading inherently includes the argument that element 220 of Chen et al. is only available for downloading.

Second, the Examiner alleged that Applicant's argument that the standard library

designing information 206 (or 220) of Chen et al. is only available for downloading is not directed to features recited in the claims. However, this argument directly supports Applicant's conclusion that since the standard library designing information 206 (or 220) of Chen et al. is only available for downloading, at least a part of the standard library designing information 206 (or 220) of Chen et al. CANNOT be added to the custom library designing information (see, for example, Applicant's arguments in the first full paragraph on page 15 in the Amendment filed June 13, 2007).

Thus, Chen et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features and method step of "adding at least part of the newly designed IC information to the custom library designing information that is stored in the manager, thereby updating the custom library designing information," as recited in Applicant's claim 1, and similarly in Applicant's claims 17, 20, and 22-24.

Third, on page 7 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged "the claims do not appear to recite a limitation that the SOC designs may be used by other designers." Nevertheless, the Examiner further alleged "Chen appears to suggest that SOC designs may be used by other designers because figure 20 and paragraph [0129] teach the SOC designs stored on a server 2006 with multiple client devices 2002 accessing the server 2006, and it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the invention that data stored on a server was accessible by multiple clients." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As addressed above, the argument that the SOC designs disclosed by Chen et al. may not be used by other designers directly supports Applicant's conclusion that the SOC design of a particular designer is NOT added to a custom library designing information that is stored in the manager such that it is available to other designers.

Fig. 20 and paragraph [0129] of Chen et al. do not teach or remotely suggest that the multiple client devices 2002 (i.e., designers) have access to SOC designs of other client devices 2002 stored on the server 2006. The Examiner's allegation that it would have been obvious that data stored on the server would be accessible by multiple clients misses the mark as the Examiner does not state exactly what data should be

accessible to the multiple clients. Clearly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the system of Chen et al. to allow designers to have access to other designer's SOC designs. As the Examiner is well aware, SOC designs are the result of much effort and expense on the part of the designer. Thus, lacking any specific teaching by Chen et al. to the contrary, SOC designers would NOT be willing to share their SOC designs with other designers.

Thus, Chen et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features and method step of "adding at least part of the newly designed IC information to the custom library designing information that is stored in the manager, thereby updating the custom library designing information" as recited in Applicant's claim 1, and similarly in Applicant's claims 17, 20, and 22-24.

The Examiner relied upon Dole and Haase to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Chen et al. However, Dole and Haase clearly fail to teach or suggest the features and method step of "adding at least part of the newly designed IC information to the custom library designing information that is stored in the manager, thereby updating the custom library designing information," as recited in Applicant's claim 1, and similarly in Applicant's claims 17, 20, and 22-24. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Dole and Haase fail to cure the deficiencies of Chen et al., described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 17, 20, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. in view of Dole and Haase.

The Examiner relied upon Frank et al. to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Chen et al., Dole, and Haase. However, Frank et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features and method step of "adding at least part of the newly designed IC information to the custom library designing information that is stored in the manager, thereby updating the custom library designing information," as recited in Applicant's claim 1, and similarly in Applicant's claims 17, 20, and 22-24. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Frank et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Chen et al., Dole, and Haase described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Chen et al., Dole, Haase, and

Frank et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of features and method steps recited in Applicant's claim 1, and similarly in Applicant's claims 17, 20, and 22-24.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 17, 20, and 22-24 are allowable. Claims 2-16 and 18 depend upon claims 1 and 17, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 17 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 26, 2007

/Stephen R. Funk #57,751/
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Stephen R. Funk
Registration No. 57,751